Serial No. 10/578,919

Reply Dated: July 22, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 22, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010971.57431US

REMARKS

Claims 13-33 are pending in the application. Claims 20 and 21 have been

amended. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 13-19.

Applicants further gratefully acknowledge the allowability of claims 21-24

and 26-33 if rewritten into independent form. Accordingly, applicants have

amended claim 21 to be in independent form and hence allowable. Claims 22-24

and 26-33 depend, directly or indirectly from claim 21, and hence are also now

submitted to be in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, independent claim 20 and dependent claim 25 were

rejected as being anticipated by Mori (US 5,390,485). In view of the clarifying

amendment made to claim 20 in the following remarks, applicants respectfully

traverse this rejection.

Applicants have clarified the spinning arrangement of claim 21 by noting

that the drafting unit feeds a staple fiber strand and that the deflecting device

temporarily deflects a complete staple fiber strand. The vacuum chamber that is

included in the deflecting device has its low pressure temporarily increased for

deflecting the complete fiber strand (see, for example, paragraphs [0008] and

[0040]).

Page 8 of 10

Serial No. 10/578,919

Reply Dated: July 22, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 22, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010971.57431US

In contrast, Mori does not disclose applicants' claimed deflecting device for

temporarily deflecting a complete staple fiber strand, wherein a vacuum

chamber included in the deflecting device has its low pressure temporarily

increased for deflecting the complete fiber strand. In that regard, applicants

provide a deflecting device within the context of the present invention that

temporarily deflects the complete fiber strand. The alleged "deflecting device" of

Mori is not a deflecting device within the meaning of the present invention, but

rather operates all of the time during the spinning operation (not temporarily).

Indeed, if Mori's spinning apparatus would deflect the complete fiber strand as

recited in applicants' claim 20, then the spinning process of Mori would become

impossible.

What Mori does provide is a collecting device, which has the object to

reduce a loss of fiber material by returning it to the front roller of the drafting

unit. This is not a deflecting device that temporarily deflects a complete fiber

strand.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit amended claim 20 is

patentable over Mori. Further, claim 25 depends from claim 20 and should also

be found patentable.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit claims 13-33 are

now all in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is solicited.

Page 9 of 10

Serial No. 10/578,919

Reply Dated: July 22, 2008

Reply to Office Action Mailed: April 22, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 010971.57431US

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in

general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this

should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as

a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and

please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit

Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010971.57431US).

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Sanok, Reg. No. 32,169/

Jeffrey D. Sanok

Registration No. 32,169

July 22, 2008

CROWELL & MORING LLP Intellectual Property Group P.O. Box 14300 Washington, DC 20044-4300 Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500 Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844

JDS:kms 6120116_1